

### REMARKS

Claims 106-131 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 132-160 have been added and therefore are pending in the present application. Claims 132-160 are supported by claims 106-131. In addition, claims 156-159 are supported by pages 44 and 45 of the specification.

It is respectfully submitted that the present amendment presents no new issues or new matter and places this case in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is requested.

#### I. Priority

The Office stated that Applicants can not obtain the benefit of the priority date of Danish application 0272/95 filed March 17, 1995.

The specification has been amended to add a section "Cross-Reference to Related Applications." Applicants note that this application does not claim the benefit of PCT/DK96/00105 filed March 118, 1996.

Applicants request that they be accorded the benefit of all prior applications.

#### II. The Objection to the Specification

The Office objected to the specification because it fails to comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.821 through 1.825. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

All of the sequences contained in the specification are in the Sequence Listing which accompanied the application as filed. Applicants therefore submit that this objection has been overcome.

The Office also objected to the specification because it contained an embedded hyperlink. The specification has been amended to remove the hyperlink. Therefore, this objection has been overcome.

Third, the Office objected to the specification because some abbreviations are not defined. The abbreviation "S-CEVU" is defined at page 57 of the specification and the abbreviation "DSC" is defined at page 67 of the specification. Therefore, this objection has been overcome.

Finally, the Office objected to the tables on pages 66, 68 and 70. The table on page 66 has been amended to align the headings. Applicants submit that the results disclosed in the tables on pages 68 and 70 can be understood by persons of ordinary skill in the art without any headings. Applicants therefore submit that this objection has been overcome.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the specification overcomes these objections. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections.

**III. The Objection to Claim 129**

The Office objected to claim 129 because it was numbered 122. Claim 129 has been canceled. Therefore, this objection is rendered moot.

**IV. The Rejection of Claims 118-122 under 35 U.S.C. 112**

Claims 118-122 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Specifically, the Office requested that Applicants provide the assurances required under 35 C.F.R. 1.801 – 1.809 for the biological material recited in these claims.

As requested by the Examiner, Applicants confirm that biological material was deposited at Deutsche Sammlung von Mikroorganismen und Zellkulturen GmbH (DSMZ) under the Budapest Treaty and assigned accession number DSMZ 10081. All restrictions on the availability to the public of said deposited material will be irrevocably removed upon the granting of the U.S. patent. Said deposit will be maintained for (a) thirty years, (b) at least five years after the most recent request for the furnishing of a sample of the deposit is received by the depository, or (c) the enforceable life of the U.S. patent granted from this application, whichever is longest. If the deposited material becomes inviable during the above term, the deposited material will be replaced.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the claims overcome this rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

**V. The Rejection of Claim 106 under 35 U.S.C. 112**

Claim 106 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite. Claim 106 has been rewritten as claim 132 to address this rejection. Applicants therefore, submit that this rejection has been overcome.

**VI. The Rejection of Claims 106-129 under 35 U.S.C. 103**

Claims 106-129 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Skinner et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,081,328) or Yu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,966,850). Claims 106-129 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Therefore, these rejections are rendered moot.

**VII. The Rejection of Claims 130 and 131 under 35 U.S.C. 103**

Claims 130 and 131 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable in view of Skinner et al. or Yu et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Skinner et al. and Yu et al. disclose a *Thielavia terrestris* cellulase. However, neither Skinner et al. nor Yu et al. teach or suggest detergent compositions.

Moreover, the instant specification demonstrates that the cellulases of the present invention have improved performance in detergents. See, e.g., pages 68-72 of the specification. These results are surprising and unexpected.


For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the claims overcome this rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

**VIII. Conclusion**

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all claims are in condition for allowance. Early action to that end is respectfully requested. The Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if there are any questions concerning this amendment or application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 11, 2003

  
Elias J. Lambiris, Reg. No. 33,728  
Novozymes North America, Inc.  
500 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1600  
New York, NY 10110  
(212) 840-0097

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

SEP 12 2003

**OFFICIAL**